



Sincerely yours,  
Ted Kaczynski

# THE UNABOMBER LETTERS

## A YAHOO NEWS SPECIAL REPORT

# "I'm not crazy"

From the earliest days of his case, Kaczynski, who was diagnosed by court psychiatrists as schizophrenic, denied he was mentally ill and tried to block his attorneys from using that diagnosis in his defense, out of fear it would undermine his anti-technology message.

All letters and documents are property of  
the University of Michigan Library's Labadie Collection.

The selection was curated by Yahoo News

# YAHOO!

NEWS



### Important Note:

After Dr. Froming left yesterday, I asked Gary if she could collaborate with Dr. Kriegler, and Gary thought it would be alright.

However, I've now reconsidered. Even though I like Dr. Froming personally, I don't want her to get involved in the case. Some time ago I explained to you (Gary and Scharlette) that I don't want to get shrinks' conclusions about me because I felt I would be obliged to face up to those conclusions publicly. When the causes of a person's behavior have been scientifically analyzed, his actions cease to be expressions of free will and become mere psychological and/or biological phenomena, perhaps pathological ones. This inevitably demeans his actions and detracts from respect for them. Furthermore, to allow shrinks to analyze my mind is inconsistent with my philosophy. That's why I wish I'd never consented to be examined by any shrinks in the first place, except maybe Dr. Kriegler, because I hope her study of my family will help me to refute my



brother's and mother's lies. I had hoped that Dr. Froming's tests might prove Foster and the Gurs to be wrong, but, as we've seen, they proved me wrong!

However, things are now in a position that I do not find wholly unacceptable. I can truthfully say that while shrinks have found me to have a deficiency in the recognition of social cues, the cause of this deficiency is undetermined, and its exact relationship to my life and my actions is still largely a matter for speculation. This still leaves considerable room for "free will." I don't want to risk any further work — such as a collaboration between Froming and Kriegler — that would make my actions into more of a mechanistic product of social and/or biological forces.

So please do not put Froming and Kriegler in contact with one another. I will write Dr. Froming a polite note in which I will explain that even though I like her very much personally, we will probably not require her services any further. I will leave it up to you to explain the reasons to her, to the extent that you consider it desirable to explain them.



Simply from the point of view of my own personal curiosity, I would find it fascinating to let Froming pursue the investigation further. Particularly intriguing is the question of how my own traits could be connected with those of other family members, especially, my mother. Notice that my mother shares with me the following traits:

High level of verbal skills.

Social isolation during adolescence. (In fact, my mother's social isolation during adolescence was far more extreme than mine.)

Large fund of suppressed anger.

Stubbornness and determination.

Failure to form close personal relationships.

(As far as I know, my mother's only truly unselfish relationship was with my father. And she's had no close relationships at all apart from her husband, her two sons, and her two siblings. Apart from these people, I don't think she ever has any warm, affectionate, or generous feelings — her friendships are superficial.)

Are these similarities of genetic origin?  
Are they due to the common history of abuse?  
Or something else? It would be extremely



interesting to know whether my mother also has a deficiency in the recognition of social cues.

However, as I've explained, I don't think these questions should be explored further.



Received 6-12-97  
NOTE TO ATTORNEYS

02-0660

June 12, 1997

Before our meeting yesterday, I had had the impression that there was a distinction between a "mental-state" defense and an "insanity" defense. I had thought that a "mental state" defense could be something like a "temporary insanity" defense, so that if you win they just let you out.

So don't get your hopes up about that type of mental-state defense that I suggested yesterday. I'm still thinking about it, but I probably won't agree to it.

Within a few days I will send you a note in which I will outline the various courses of action that I would consider acceptable. You lawyers can then chew it over, and then I'll be prepared (on a couple of days notice) to make a definite decision whenever you are.



Received 6-18-97  
Note to Attorneys

Gary, Scharlette, and Judy

June 17, 1997

02-0699

①

I want to apologize again for my outburst of anger at our June 17 meeting. I especially want to apologize to Gary since he was sitting across from me and bore the brunt of my attack.

Actually, the outburst was more or less planned, though, once I got started, I let myself get rather more aggressive than I had originally intended. Judy had told me on Monday that she and Gary were going to talk to me on Tuesday about "the Froming letter" that I proposed to send. Since my contacts with Dr. Froming would presumably relate to the case only in terms of some sort of mental-health defense, and since I'd sent you notes of a negative character concerning mental-state defenses, I thought it likely that you were going to talk to me about such defenses at Tuesday's meeting.

That's why the first thing I asked you when I came into J booth on Tuesday was whether you were going to argue with me about mental-state defenses. Meanwhile I'd been stewing all morning, getting frustrated over the fact that (as I saw it) you refused to accept some of



my decisions, and, equally, over the fact that — simply because you're all so nice to me — I find it difficult to put my foot down and take a firm stand against you in our meetings. I made up my mind that this time I was really going to get tough, and if you tried to sell me on a mental-state defense again I would cuss you out and show you that you were going to have to let me make my own decision on that issue.

So, by the time I got up to J-booth, I had (more or less intentionally) primed myself to explode.

I think Gary was hurt by my outburst more than I realized until afterward, so, once again, I apologize especially to him.

In my present position of powerlessness I am even more susceptible to frustration than I usually am, so I think our relations will be smoother if you will be careful not to make me feel pressured in our discussions. Rather than being forceful or persistent in your arguments (as some of you have been sometimes), take an easy-going approach —



just make your points and invite me to think them over. I think you know that I'll be cautious and deliberate in making decisions.

If you think I've failed to absorb some of the information you've given me relating to a given discussion, you can repeat yourself without making me feel pressured if you do it in a sufficiently low-keyed way. There is a way of expressing an argument that conveys to your interlocutor that you are very anxious to have him accept your point of view (that's what makes me feel pressured), and there's a way of expressing an argument that conveys to your interlocutor that you will readily accept whatever decision he makes (and that's what I feel comfortable with). I think you'll find that in the long run it's more productive to reason with me in the latter, low-keyed, way.

It's true that I do sometimes fail to absorb, or else forget, some of the information that you give me. For example, on Tuesday, June 17, Gary explained to me that there are two ways



of formulating a mental-state defense, and that one way would not involve commitment to an institution. I think now that he explained that to me once before, but I forgot. And I think Scharlette explained to me once before that written reports could be given, but only after a trial, and this too I had forgotten.

So you can repeat information that you think I've forgotten or failed to absorb, as long as you do it in a neutral way that doesn't make me feel that you are pushing me to make the decision that you want.

I hope that my feeling pressured hasn't been the result of misreading social cues.

I very much appreciate your forbearance and your willingness to forgive me when frustration gets the better of me. Thank you all.

June 18 - today I'm feeling very bad about the fact that I spoke to you so harshly — not to say viciously — yesterday; and you're always so kind to me! I'll have to try to keep my frustration under better control, but unfortunately I can't promise that I will succeed.



Received 6-16-97  
Note to Attorney

Note #26

VERY SENSITIVE

Copies to

Quin, Judy, Gary, Ted

#26-1

02-0686

### Concerning possible defenses

After thorough reconsideration I have decided that no form of mental-state defense will be acceptable to me.

You have argued that such a defense would be a means by which I could put my side of the story before the public. But the public will know nothing about the trial except what the media tell, and media reports have consistently been biased against me, and have contained gross distortions and outright falsehoods. So this method of making public my side of the story may well backfire. It will be better for me to write my side of the story myself.

Furthermore, even if we won on a mental-state defense, it could only lead to my being confined in a mental institution for many years, if not for life. Gary argued that I would be able to get out fairly soon because my history shows that I am a man of my word, so that if I promise to be law-abiding the shrinks will believe that I am not dangerous, and will let me out.

Come on, get real! Consider the situation:



VERY SENSITIVE

#26-2

02-0687

The Gurs and Foster both concluded that I had a brain lesion and they believed it was related to my supposed crimes. Froming concluded that I had a deficiency in recognition of social cues, and sources of brain injury figured prominently among the possible causes that she mentioned. So if I were thoroughly tested out, it is likely that some form of neurological damage would be found, and that the shrinks would believe that it was related in one way or another to my supposed crimes.

If treatment can be imposed against the will of a patient who is confined in a mental institution for having committed a crime, then that by itself would lead me to categorically refuse a mental-state defense. If treatment cannot be imposed involuntarily, then I certainly would refuse all treatment.

So look at the case from the point of view of a shrink who has to decide whether I am non-dangerous and can be released. Let's assume that he or she is a person of integrity and is absolutely immune to political pressure. Remember that a person of integrity not only will be immune to political pressure, but will be careful not to release a patient if there is a risk that he may kill someone.



VERY SENSITIVE

#26-3

02-0688

Against releasing the patient.

1. The patient is believed to have killed three people and maimed several others in the course of a determined campaign spanning 17 years.
2. For at least the last four attacks, the patient has no remorse.
3. The patient has held long and tenaciously to a system of values that rejects the morality of the existing society.
4. Either the patient has refused to cooperate with testing, or else testing has revealed neurological damage that is believed to be at least partly responsible for his supposed crimes.
5. The patient has refused all treatment.
6. Neither the patient's neurological condition nor his psychological condition have changed substantially since his commitment to the institution.
7. The patient has been in the institution



VERY SENSITIVE

# 26-4

02-0689

no more than 5 years.

8. There are several documented instances of the patient's lying to representatives of the system. (I lied to the Murray researchers, I lied on application forms in order to get employment, I lied to the cops who came to question me after the vandalization of that house near my cabin.)

For releasing the patient.

1. The patient's history shows that in personal relationships (as opposed to relationships with representatives of the system) he is a man of his word; and he promises the shrinks (who are representatives of the system) that he will henceforth obey the law.

Under these circumstances, a shrink would have to be an utter fool to conclude that there was no substantial risk in releasing the patient.

Thus the notion that I could be released within (say) five years, after being committed to a mental institution on a mental-state defense, is extremely far-fetched.



VERY SENSITIVE  
Acceptable alternatives

#26-5

02-0690

1. I categorically refuse to use a mental-state defense. I've heard all the arguments, and this is my firm decision, so I'd appreciate it if you would refrain from arguing with me further on this subject, unless you have something new to tell me. And by "something new" I mean something radically new, not just a variation on the same old themes.

If such a defense were used, I would want to publish a transcript of the trial, or of the most important parts of it, in order to correct the distortions of media reports.

2. Negotiate a deal to make a guilty plea — or, much better, a "no-contest" plea (nolo contendere, Alford plea, or whatever you call it) — in order to bypass a trial and go straight to the suppression appeal. Any such deal would have to include a guarantee that I will remain right where I am at least until Nov 12, so that I can be sure that my opportunities for writing and communicating will be no worse than they are now.

3. Even if alternative 2 proves impossible, I could plead guilty — or, better, "no contest"



Received By Amy  
From Ted 12-3-96

VERY SENSITIVE

Nov 27,  
1996

(1)

01-0141

I don't like the tack that Dr. Foster suggested toward the end of our Nov 26 meeting.

His idea, as you may remember, was to show that because of my social disabilities — specifically, insensitivity to nonverbal cues — left me with no choice but to carry out actions that would otherwise seem either bad or crazy. But this seems to imply acceptance of the view that the actions were either bad or crazy. I do not want to concede, even by implication, that the actions were bad or crazy. I want to portray those actions as reasonable ones to take given the condition of our society.

Your objections to this will be: (a) It won't go over with the jury, and (b) the general public will continue to reject those actions in any case.

But if this case goes to trial, I assume that my chances of getting released within an acceptable span of time are slight, so I may as well forget about the personal goal of getting released and concentrate on the public goal. And as for the public goal, persuasion of the general public has to take second place to



VERY SENSITIVE

Nov 27,  
1996

(2)

winning and keeping the respect of a small minority of potential revolutionaries, because, now and for some time in the future, the general public will not be persuaded to approve more than inadequate reforms anyway. See manifesto, paragraphs 111, 186, 187, 189.

There are many potential revolutionaries who do regard my actions as reasonable.\* If I publicly concede (even by implication) that they were not reasonable, I risk losing at least part of the respect that these potential revolutionaries have for me and my message.

Also in order to retain the respect of these potential revolutionaries, it is important to portray my actions as undertaken through the exercise of free will and not as determined by psychological forces. I am enough of a materialist to suppose that human behavior can ultimately be explained on the basis of the laws of physics and chemistry, but all the same my actions will appear to be demeaned if some shrink

---

\* See "Green Anarchist" and various communications in my file, especially those from John Zerzan.



Received FROM T.R. VERY SENSITIVE

Nov 27,  
1996

(3)

can plausibly trace biological or psychological forces that seem to have determined those actions.

One anarchist pointed out in a letter to me that the system tries to portray problems as personal rather than societal. In other words, when an individual comes into conflict with the system, the cause is ascribed to defects in the individual rather than to defects in the system. I don't want to fall into the trap of portraying my conflict with the system in terms of defects in me rather than in the system.

It would be acceptable, however to take some such line as this: Given the condition of our society, violence can plausibly be seen as a reasonable alternative. And my decision to attack the system was my own free choice — the shrinks (fortunately) do not yet know enough about the human mind to fully explain why people would make such choices. Nevertheless, I would have used nonviolent means if I had had the social skills to start some group or organization in opposition to technology. (Which, by the way, is true — see the end of my 1972 essay.)

01-0143



TK To JZ

1/27/98

(2)

0462.0

gets migraines, and my father used to get them too, so I know they can be pretty bad.

As I write this, you must be just finishing your talk in the Gerlinger Lounge. Well, how did it go? You get a \$500 honorarium for your talk? Impressive! I hope that success won't spoil you. (That's a joke; I'm confident that you won't be spoiled.)

Unlike you, I am not relieved that the death penalty is out of the picture. In order to get that deal I had to sign away my right to an appeal that might possibly have led to my release. I signed only because I had no other way of preventing my attorneys from putting on a defense that would have portrayed me essentially as insane. My attorneys are very able lawyers and they have been very kind to me on a personal level, but my relationship with them has been a tragic and disastrous mis-match.

Have you heard anything lately from our acquaintance at Stanford, Professor A? I have not. He's probably lost interest in the case. I have an impression that he is an emotional person and perhaps not very steady or consistent.



Let me tell you about Dr. Sally Johnson, the shrink who evaluated me for mental competency.

She is a government hack, associate warden of some federal institution back east. She is also a very strange person. My lawyers tell me that in preliminary discussions at which I was not present, they kept referring to me as "Ted" while Johnson kept referring to me as "Mr. Kaczynski." My lawyers then suggested that it might be easier for her to just say "Ted" (one syllable) rather than "Mr. Kaczynski" (five syllables). Thereafter Johnson referred to me as "he"; but never as "Ted". She always wore strange, baggy dresses, as if to conceal her figure, perhaps because she had nothing worth showing off; though she wasn't fat, she looked terribly out of condition, as if she never got any exercise. Unlike any of the other people I've met since my arrest, she never offered me her hand to shake — until the end of my very last interview with her, and then her hand was so limp that it was like shaking a dead fish. I had the impression that her personality was cold.

My attorneys repeatedly tried to get her to let them sit in on the interviews, or at least to let them listen to the interviews over



0462.0 1/27/98

an intercom, but she persistently refused. This put us in the position that as to anything that might be said in the interviews, it was her word against mine. At our very last meeting she said, "If you find any errors in my report, I hope you won't think there is any intent behind it."

When I read her report I was incredulous. She had obviously started out with the assumption that I was crazy and then slanted her data to support that conclusion — slanted it so heavily that I could hardly believe it. For example, she reworded statements of mine to make them sound paranoid or otherwise indicative of mental illness, and in some cases she reported I had said things that were flatly contrary to what I did say. For instance, both in my written autobiography and orally to Dr. Johnson I stated that while I began to get along poorly with the kids on my block at the age of 8 or 9, at the same time I continued to get along well with the kids in school; Johnson said in her report that I began to get along badly both with the kids on my block and with the kids in school. She also indicated that my opinions about the technological society were "non-bizarre



delusions" symptomatic of paranoid schizophrenia

As I read her evaluation I started to ask myself, "Can it be that I actually am crazy? — because this can't really be happening; a licensed psychiatrist occupying a responsible position with the government can't be submitting a report that is this irrational."

Luckily, the next day I received a batch of your letters that expressed your support and that of other people you told me about, and this gave me reassurance that there are a lot of people out there who know I'm not crazy. A great relief to me, because without that kind of support it's possible that the shrink might be able to convince a man in my position that he actually is insane.

But to tell the truth, now that I look back on it, Johnson's report eases my mind. Some defense shrink had concluded that I was a paranoid schizophrenic, but, in the reports that I saw, they gave only a sketchy indication of how they arrived at that conclusion. Since they appeared to rely heavily on the neuropsychological testing and claimed to be using objective criteria, they had me wondering quite seriously whether I might not have some



mild form of paranoid schizophrenia. But Johnson's report is so inaccurate as to factual details, so irrational generally, and uses such highly subjective criteria, that it takes away all my respect for the shrinks' methods. Also, when one considers the discrepancies between the interpretations of the prosecution shrinks on the one hand, those of Johnson on the other hand, and those of the defense shrinks on the third hand (it's convenient to imagine for a moment that we have three hands) it becomes clear that this stuff has no scientific basis.

I hasten to add that I recognize I am different from the average person, I don't know whether my difference has a neurological basis, and I am not in a position to assert that it has no relation to paranoid schizophrenia. But I am confident that I do not have delusions and am capable of rational thought.

Whew! I'm glad I got all that off my chest. On that subject I will only add that all this fulfills a prediction made by the lawyer who represented me in Montana, Michael



Donahoe. He said that the government would try to portray me as sick, but not sick enough to escape the death penalty.

I recently had a talk with Quin Denvir, and he told me that the Federal Defenders at this stage will be quite comfortable about my consulting with outside lawyers, and that they will even facilitate such interactions for me.

He specifically mentioned that I might talk with our mutual friend — the one who was scared off by Judy Clarke's verbal aggression.

If our mutual friend is still willing to talk with me, I believe I can arrange for him to visit me under such conditions that he will not have to come in direct contact with Quin Denvir or Judy Clarke, and I can promise him that they will raise no objections to his visit. Even though the trial is over, I still need legal advice, and for more than one reason the Fed Defenders are not suitable sources for that advice. If our mutual friend is no-longer interested in talking to me, can he recommend another lawyer who would be willing to give me some advice pro bono?



TK to JZ

0452.0

1/27/98

⑧

The fact that Quin Denvir is actually encouraging me to speak with an outside lawyer means that I no longer feel I have to separate myself from the Fed Defenders, (provided that our mutual friend does not consider my relationship with them to be an obstacle to his meeting with me), because for all practical purposes the Fed Defs will no longer be representing me except at the May 15 sentencing. And it will be convenient for me to keep them formally as my representatives until May 15 because that way they will be able to continue to perform many services for me, such as bringing me documents, etc. Really, they are so helpful and kind to me that I often feel guilty about having had such conflicts with them over the defense strategy.

Please let me know what our mutual friend thinks about this.

One more piece of news: It's been announced that I will not be prosecuted on a California state charge. I don't know whether that's good or bad.

I guess that's enough for one letter.

With many thanks for your support,

P.S. John, I suggest that you save this letter permanently.

Ted



TED KACZYNSKI to  
DR. MICHAEL ALEKSIUK

August 30, 1998.

Dear P. ....,

I apologize for taking so long to answer your letter of July 2, but it's taken me ~~that~~<sup>this</sup> long to get a copy of the section on Asperger's disorder from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual.

I don't regard your opinion that I have Asperger's disorder as an insult. Some time ago a psychiatrist wrote to me expressing the same opinion. However, I haven't taken your or her diagnosis very seriously, because your and her information about me comes almost exclusively from the media, and media reports about me have been wildly ~~is~~ inaccurate. I did, however, take the trouble (as indicated above) to get the section on Asperger's ~~is~~ disorder from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, and it does ~~not~~ not seem to me that I have the symptoms of Asperger's as described there.

I've written a book in which I correct some of the nonsense that the media have printed about me. If you're sufficiently interested in my case, I suggest that you read ~~it~~<sup>the book</sup>, and if after doing so you <sup>still</sup> think I have Asperger's, please let me know and I'll try to get a copy of Chapter 2 of Uta Frith's Autism and Asperger Syndrome.  
(to ~~you~~) ~~Since~~ Since you apparently don't want your family ~~to know~~ ~~that you have~~ or acquaintances to know that you have

Asperger's disorder, I assume you want your letter to me to be kept private. I can (a) destroy the letter, (b) send it back to you, or (c) give it to the Labadie Collection of the University of Michigan Library, to which I am donating my personal papers. If I give your letter to the Labadie Collection, it will remain private and sealed until the year 2015. Which would you prefer (a), (b), or (c)?



prefer Mike? Anyway, Michael or Mike, I invite you to write me more about your experiences in the woods whenever you please, and I'm sure that I will enjoy your letters on that subject. And someday, when some of my current issues have been settled, I expect I'll be able to find time to write you a letter much longer than this one.

Warm regards,

Ted Kaczynski

P.S. I don't share your taste in music. Bob Dylan — ugh! He repels me. I much prefer Vivaldi.

— TK



The markings in black ink on these yellow sheets were made on October 15, 1998.

omit

However, just a few days after I had committed myself to Donahoe and the Federal Defenders by turning down Serra's offer, and one or two days before I was taken from Montana to Sacramento, Donahoe told me that he had changed his mind and would not come to California to represent me. I think the reason was that the role assigned him on the Sacramento defense team was too minor to suit his taste, though of course this was not what he told me.

Now, to go back to the time of my arrest, as soon as I was taken into custody, the media started portraying me as a madman, and it wasn't long before my brother and mother began helping them. (I now have solid documentary proof that my brother and mother were lying about me, and I hope to publish this proof in the not too distant future.) Needless to say, I was extremely anxious to refute the image of me that the media had created.

The most obvious way to refute it would be to let myself be examined by a mental-health specialist. However, I



have always objected to the mental-health professions, because it is my firm belief that science has no business probing the workings of the human mind. Moreover, when mental-health professionals assess an individual by methods that are not strictly objective, their conclusions are heavily influenced by their own prejudices and presuppositions. Thus I was afraid that the mere fact that I was accused of being the Unabomber would lead most psychiatrists to interpret the data in such a way as to conclude that I was mentally ill.

But a few years earlier I'd read a book, published in about 1973, according to which there was a relatively simple set of strictly objective tests by which schizophrenia (the most common form of mental illness after depression) could be reliably diagnosed. I was confident that I wasn't schizophrenic, and the fact that the tests purportedly were objective ~~took~~ eliminated the risk of investigator bias, so I thought it would be helpful in refuting the image of me created by the media if I could undergo these tests<sup>1</sup>. I suggested the same to Michael Donahoe, and he



arranged for me to be tested by a neuropsychologist named Dale Watson.

To judge from his clothes, manner, and speech, Watson seemed to be a highly conventional and conforming person, but at the same time he was gentle and mild and I was somewhat inclined to like him. He seemed very competent.

The tests he gave me were much different from what I'd expected, and much more extensive and elaborate. Donahoe later reported the results to me: He said Watson had found no sign of a neurological disorder, except that the left hemisphere of my brain was functioning at a substantially higher level than the right. Since that didn't seem particularly important, I wanted to leave it at that—a relatively clean bill of health.

Donahoe, however, told me that Watson suggested consulting a couple named <sup>Ruben</sup> Reuben (sp?) and <sup>Raquel</sup> Rachel (sp?) Gur about the difference between the two halves of my brain. <sup>Ruben</sup> Reuben wanted to give me some additional neuropsychological tests and <sup>Raquel</sup> Rachel wanted to have an interview with me. I did not want to go through these ~~further tests~~ examinations, ~~ions~~, because of my objection



in principle to the mental-health sciences, because (having gotten a relatively clean bill of health) I felt it was best to let well enough alone, and because an interview could not be a strictly objective way of gathering information and therefore was subject to investigator bias. Michael Donahoe, however, insisted that according to the Gurs the interview would be strictly objective (which hardly seemed plausible to me), and he put me under heavy pressure to submit to the examinations. Because of my personal feelings toward him<sup>2</sup> and my sense of dependence on him, I gave in, very reluctantly and against my better judgement.<sup>4</sup>

The Gurs turned out to be a distinctly repellent couple, at least in my eyes. Reuben<sup>Ruben</sup> was a big man, about fifty years old, with a pot-belly and a kind of fake air of masculinity; Rachel<sup>Raquel</sup>, probably in her late forties, was a goofy-looking woman with peculiar mannerisms. Rachel<sup>Raquel</sup> spent a few hours interviewing me, and after that Reuben<sup>Ruben</sup> gave me some neuropsychological tests. The Gurs and Donahoe left the jail where I was being



held, conversed for a couple of hours, and returned to the jail, and then spoke to me at length. At this point <sup>Reuben</sup> Reuben had not yet graded his neuropsychological tests, so that what they had to say was based solely on Rachel's interviews, my 1979 autobiography (the only part of my writings that the Gurs had read), and the fact that Dale Watson's results showed an inequality between the left and right halves of my brain.

The Gurs described their conclusions as tentative, but they seemed pretty confident that they were correct. They said that at some point very early in life I had suffered some injury to the right side of my brain, and that this resulted in what they described as a mild form of schizophrenia. Among the symptoms they mentioned my "shyness" and my "determination". They also mentioned as symptoms certain things that to me appeared ludicrous; For example, I reported in my autobiography that when I was three years old a four-year-old kid remarked to me scornfully that I was "only three," and I refused to admit that that was my age; and <sup>Reuben</sup> Reuben Gur pointed to this as a symptom of my alleged disorder.



I don't know whether the Gurs' diagnosis was correct, but it seems to me that the Gurs concluded that I had schizophrenia from the fact that I was accused of being the Unabomber, from Dale Watson's results, and from certain things that I reported in my interviews and autobiography, and this conclusion then biased their vision so that they saw as symptoms certain other things in my interviews and autobiography that, under other circumstances, would have been considered normal, such as the "three-year-old" incident.

Needless to say, I did not like the Gurs' conclusion that I had schizophrenia, but that was not the main thing about them that bothered me. What was offensive was their attitude and the kind of people they were. Like many mental-health professionals, they were thoroughly conventional and narrow-minded, and utterly unable to appreciate anything outside of the upper-middle-class world-view. For example, in reference to my decision to go live in the woods, <sup>Raquel</sup> Rachel mentioned some acquaintances of hers who, after following an academic career, had retired early



11

and gone to live "in the country" under respectable circumstances. She asked me, rhetorically, why I couldn't have done likewise, the implication being that the decision to go live in the woods while young and in low economic circumstances was itself a symptom of mental illness. The Gurs did not address me as an equal with whom they could rationally discuss their conclusions, but as a "case" who had to be handled. <sup>Raquel</sup> Rachel, especially, was condescending, except when (as happened once or twice) she came close to being openly insulting. I don't think the Gurs intended to be condescending; I think they just didn't know how to conceal their contempt for everything outside the pale of their narrow values. Needless to say, I declined to undergo the further testing that the Gurs wanted to subject me to.

One part of my conversation with <sup>Ruben</sup> Reuben Gur is worth reporting. I pointed out that as science learns more and more about the working of the brain, and learns to associate behaviors that are conventionally regarded as "undesirable with neurological traits, these traits are then



labelled "disorders," so that an ever-larger segment of the population is considered as suffering from a "disorder" of one kind or another. I suggested that if psychiatry today were in the state that it was in thirty years ago, a psychiatrist examining me would have found no disorder. <sup>Reuben</sup> Reuben agreed that this was the case. I went on to say that human behavior that cannot be explained scientifically is seen as being the outcome of free will, and that as science becomes able to explain more and more of human behavior in neurological terms, the area of free will becomes ever smaller. <sup>Reuben</sup> Reuben answered, "Yes, the area of free will does become smaller and smaller, and maybe it will vanish."

Needless to say, I did not enjoy being told I had a form of schizophrenia. However, but what principally upset me was not that, but the Gurs' attitude. I remained calm during the interview with them, but afterward I let Michael Donahoe know that I resented the fact that he had talked me into letting them examine me.

\* \* \* \* \*



Manual transcription of part of letter from  
Ted Kaczynski to Michael Donahoe dated  
November 17, 1998:

In the report that they wrote for my  
defense team on November 15, 1997, Ruben and  
Raquel Gur lied about me. They wrote:

"Mr. Kaczynski's affect was generally flat and  
blunted with little change in prosody or facial  
expression. There was a marked inability to  
elaborate on description of his feelings. He struggled  
for words and broke eye contact. Attempts to  
discuss the affective content of significant life  
experiences produced indications of humiliation,  
panic, and hostility. At one point, Mr. Kaczynski  
became red in the face, banged his hand on  
the table in front of him a few times, and  
stated to the examiner twice 'You are the  
enemy.' At other times his affect was  
childish, immature and inappropriate."

You were not present during my interview  
with Raquel Gur alone, but you were present  
the next day at my conversation with Ruben  
and Raquel Gur together, and you got to know  
me pretty well while I was in the Lewis and  
Clark County Jail. So the first question I  
want to ask you is

(1) Do you think that the foregoing description  
of my behavior is a plausible one? [OVER]



Now, most of the statements in the description are more-or-less, let us say, imprecise or subjective, so that they could conceivably be the result of gross bias rather than conscious, calculated lying. But the statement that I got red in the face and repeatedly banged my hand on the table is such a clear falsehood that I can only attribute it to conscious lying.

What actually happened was that in a calm and friendly tone — without anger of any kind and certainly without banging my hand on the table — I told Raquel Gur that from my point of view she, as a neuropsychiatrist, was "the enemy." I said this without antagonism and simply to clarify our respective positions.

The second question I have for you is (2) Do you recall the fact that, at the meeting next day where you, I, Raquel, and Ruben Gur were present, Raquel referred to the fact that I had stated that from my point of view she was an enemy, and she thanked me for having "laid that on the table"? Did it sound to you as if she were describing an angry outburst on my part?

[I made this transcription on 7/5/05. — TJK]  
[Donahoe never answered this. — TJK 5/2/12]



culture of "despair" at Harvard. Chase may have encountered such an atmosphere in certain quarters at Harvard, but I did not.

2.(a) What is my assessment of my lawyers' attempts to use an 'insanity' defense? You can best learn the answer to that question by reading my petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, including the exhibits, which, judging from the content of your letter, I imagine will be of considerable interest to you. You should be able to get a copy of the petition through Attorney's Diversified Services, 1424 21st Street, Sacramento CA 95814, telephone 916-441-4396. Ask for U.S.A. v. Kaczynski, Case No. CR-S-96-259-GEB, United States District Court, Eastern District of California, Clerk's record No. 576, Motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, filed April 23, 1999.

(b) How would I define insanity? I would define it in terms of the extent to which an individual is out of touch with reality. Presumably no one has a perfectly accurate perception of reality, but some people have a reasonably accurate perception of it while, at the other extreme, some people (in the most severe cases of schizophrenia) are so lost in a world of hallucinations and/or delusions that they are completely out of touch with reality. I'm not interested in quibbling about the precise point



along this continuum at which one should draw the line between sanity and insanity. But I do want to make clear that when I refer here to "reality" I include only that reality that can be tested empirically. This leaves out all consideration of metaphysics, religion, morality, and values in general.

I am not of course suggesting that values and so forth are unimportant, but only that it sows confusion to call someone insane solely because he does something that is violently offensive to one's values.

When you call someone insane, you create an association, or imply a resemblance, between him and persons who are out of touch with empirical reality, like schizophrenics who have hallucinations and delusions. It feels good to create such a negative association for someone whose behavior profoundly offends your values or your moral standards, but the association is a source of confusion because there is no reason to suppose that one whose behavior offends you is necessarily out of touch with empirical reality or otherwise resembles schizophrenics and their like. For the sake of clarity of thinking, one ought to maintain the distinction between being out of touch with empirical reality and being out of touch with



a given system of values.

To the extent that one defines insanity in terms of immoral behavior, one's definition necessarily will be culturally relative. I have very little familiarity with the history of the Reformation, but I assume that a great many Catholics approved of Pope Leo X's order of execution for Luther because to them Luther was guilty of an unspeakable crime of heresy. If there was a madman in the case it was Luther, not Leo X. I've read somewhere or other that in Russia, even today, Stalin is widely regarded as more of a hero than a villain, much less a madman. And, of course, until rather recently homosexuality was regarded as a sickness. As moral standards have changed, so has the accepted opinion of homosexuals' mental health.

(c) What is the relationship between insanity and political power? I don't have anything substantial to say on this subject.

You may be interested to read an article by Gary Greenberg that appeared in Mc Sweeney's (Magazine, 394 A Ninth Street, Brooklyn NY 11215, email mcsweeneys@earthlink.net.), Issue No. 3, Mid to Late Summer, 1999, pages 67-119. But don't necessarily believe everything that you read in this article.



Sunday, February 25, 2001.

A few days ago — it must have been last Thursday, Feb. 22, — Watterson & Morrison, the psychologists, came by. I said to them, "You guys have told me repeatedly that you have seen no symptoms of serious mental illness in me. Can you put that in writing for me?" Watterson had no hesitation in saying "yes." (At about this time Morrison's attention was called to something outside the cell, so he didn't participate in the rest of the conversation.)

Watterson knew I was writing a petition for rehearing of my case, and divined that I wanted to use the written statement in connection with that. He said a little bit about that and then said, "Can you get a lawyer to ask us for a progress report? It would look better that way." ~~I said that yes~~ We would send the report to the lawyer, but a copy of the report would be in your file, so you could ask us for a copy of it." I said that yes, I could get a lawyer to ask for a progress report on me.

The same day, I composed a draft letter to Quin and Judy — that is, a draft of a letter that I was asking Quin and Judy to send to Watterson & Morrison requesting that they send Quin & Judy a progress report on me. Because of the need for ~~haste~~ haste, I mailed the draft letter to



Quin & Judy on the following day, Friday, February 23, without waiting to ask Watterson or Morrison whether the letter was okay. Later on Friday Watterson came by (without Morrison), and I showed him my draft letter. Watterson said the letter was alright, but he suggested that at the end of it I add the words, "regarding his psychological status, and diagnostic impressions if applicable." He then suggested that I show the letter to Morrison and get his opinion, because Morrison is a former Forensic psychologist and knows about legal stuff.

Morrison came by (without Watterson) the next day, Saturday, February 24, and I showed him the draft letter. He said did not say there was anything wrong with the letter, but he seemed very skeptical about whether he & Morrison could provide the requested progress report. He said, "If I received a letter like that I would take it to the legal department and see what they have to say about it. Normally we wouldn't do an evaluation unless we received a court order." I said I wasn't asking for an "evaluation" but only ~~for~~ for written confirmation of what Watterson & Morrison had told me repeatedly, namely, that they have detected in me no sign of serious mental illness. Morrison then repeated — actually in stronger terms than he had ever used previously — that he & Watterson had seen no signs of mental illness. He said



[2/25/01]

3.

that he and Watterson had been seeing me daily for nearly three years and had "seen nothing" — meaning nothing in the way of symptoms of mental illness. "The only thing we've seen," he went on, "is maladaptive personality traits. Your values ...". I don't remember exactly how Morrison put it, but the idea was that my values put me at odds with society. Morrison added that "nearly everyone in prison and half the people outside" also had maladaptive personality traits. He left, leaving up in the air the question of ~~if~~ whether he & Watterson would be willing or able to tell me in writing what they had repeatedly told me orally. He did say, though, that it would be up to Watterson, because "He [Watterson] is the chief."

It's Kafkaesque. It's been broadcast all over the world that I'm schizophrenic on the word of those dishonest<sup>1</sup> and/or incompetent shrinks recruited by Gary Sowards; now two qualified<sup>2</sup> shrinks who have spent 3 years with me say it's all bullshit, but for bureaucratic reasons they may not be willing to confirm it in writing. If I don't get it in writing I'll never be able to prove it, because if I

---

1. At least 2 of the shrinks (Froming and Rachel or Raquel Gur) unquestionably lied.

2. Watterson has told me that Morrison is the author of many papers that have appeared in professional journals.



\* Also, I can't get an outside shrink to come in here to evaluate me, because B.O.P. policy allows that only on court order.

4.

merely report what Watterson & Morrison have told me orally, some journalist will call up the prison and ask Watterson & Morrison whether it's true, and they of course will answer only that Bureau of Prisons regulations prohibit them from giving out any information about an inmate.\*

I should ~~mention that~~ add one reservation to the statement that Watterson & Morrison have seen nothing pathological in me except "maladaptive personality traits." Two or three times Watterson has mentioned in a jocular tone that I am "compulsive." I don't know how serious he is — he has an overactive sense of humor and is constantly joking — but I wouldn't be surprised if it's true. Roughly ten years ago I read an article in the Scientific American about obsessive-compulsive disorder. I certainly do not have a full-blown case of that disorder — I don't wash my hands with abnormal frequency or go through any ~~weird~~ <sup>weird</sup> rituals — but I do see in myself some obsessive-compulsive traits. I have a tendency to perfectionism. I put much more effort than the average person does into making sure that a job is done right and that nothing can go wrong with it. For example, when I put a stamp on an envelope I put much more care than the average person does into pressing the stamp down firmly on all sides so that it can't come loose.



[ 2/25/01 ]

5.

Also, the Scientific American article mentioned that, in childhood, obsessive-compulsives often showed an unusual concern with symmetry, and I ~~showed~~ went through a phase (perhaps for a year or so between the ages of 6 and 9) when I had that trait. For example, if I scratched one ear then I had a strong urge to scratch the other ear to make it the same on both sides; if I bumped one foot against something then I had a strong urge to bump the other foot ... and so forth.

I think I read in one of my anthropology courses, forty years ago at Harvard, that the obsessive-compulsive personality is often associated with a high level of achievement. It's easy to see why: In many fields of endeavor, <sup>perfectionism</sup> ~~perfectionism~~ will contribute to high achievement.



0755.0  
February 20, 2004  
0755.0

David N. Glaser, M.D., Inc.  
Clinical and Forensic Psychiatry

Board Certified  
Psychiatry & Neurology

The Encino Atrium  
16530 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 604  
Encino, California 91436  
(818) 382-9920 / Fax (818) 385-1995

Board Certified  
Forensic Psychiatry

No restrictions

February 5, 2004

Theodore John Kaczynski  
04475-046  
P.O. Box 8500  
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Dear Mr. Kaczynski:

It has been some time since we last communicated. I trust that in the interim period, you have been able to make the best of a bad situation.

Through one of my many contacts in Los Angeles, I have an individual who is in a financial and personal position to have your entire manuscript published, word for word.

I would like to hear from you specifically with respect to whether or not you would like me to take the next step. If you would like, I would be happy to meet with you directly and discuss this in person.

I know from the last few contacts we have had that you wanted to provide the general public with your own perspective of what led to the long road to your present state. I believe we have the opportunity (only with your consent, of course) to have your entire manuscript published and available for reading.

I look forward to your thoughts, feelings, and ideas related to what I have just written.

Sincerely,

David N. Glaser

